

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to visit and volunteer at the Philadelphia region's largest hunger relief center, Philabundance.

Philabundance, a member of the Feeding America network of food banks, aims to drive hunger out of local communities with an eye toward eradicating hunger altogether. Each week, Philabundance serves 90,000 people in the Philadelphia area through partnerships with 350 agencies and food distribution programs. Incredibly, last year alone, they distributed almost 30 million pounds of food to neighbors suffering from hunger and food insecurity in nine counties.

I was impressed by the innovative strategies Philabundance employs to feed hungry people in its region. The Philabundance Community Kitchen equips those looking to reenter the workforce with valuable life and kitchen skills, while also providing meals to those in need.

Philabundance also opened the Nation's first nonprofit grocery store called Fare & Square in Chester, a city that faced a serious economic downturn due to the loss of manufacturing jobs. Fare & Square provides affordable and healthy food to the community, as well as discounts to those who qualify.

Food banks across our country like Philabundance and places like the Worcester County Food Bank and Food Bank of Western Massachusetts, which are both in my congressional district, do incredible work to reduce hunger in surrounding communities. They employ innovative strategies to fight hunger and increase access to nutritious food for our most vulnerable neighbors.

But the truth of the matter is we know that food banks and our charitable organizations can't do it alone. Some in Congress have proposed cuts and other restrictions to our Federal antihunger and nutrition programs. We often hear from them that charities, not the government, should be responsible for eradicating hunger.

Mr. Speaker, I agree that food banks and food pantries and other charitable organizations are incredible on-the-ground partners in our effort to end hunger. They are often the first line of defense in emergency situations. But charities cannot do everything. That is just a fact.

Charities do face limitations. Many are small and only open on limited schedules. Most are run with the support of dedicated volunteers, some of whom have other full-time jobs. Often, these charities operate out of small places like basements or closets at houses of worship. Importantly, they rely on donations from members of the community as a primary source of food to distribute.

Our charities are doing an incredible job on the front lines, but ending hun-

ger will take a strong partnership between these organizations and Federal, State, and local governments. For our part, the Federal Government must continue to invest in our preeminent food and nutrition programs like SNAP, WIC, and The Emergency Food Assistance Program, known as TEFAP, just to name a few, and fight any attempts to cut or weaken them. TEFAP is especially important to our food banks, as they rely on this Federal funding to serve those in need.

We know that strong Federal investments in these critical safety net programs reduce hunger, improve the diets of low-income households, and save billions of dollars in healthcare costs. So the next time any of my colleagues try to score political points by demonizing Federal hunger programs, I ask you to think of these programs and the impacts they are having on constituents in each of our districts. I urge you to visit local food banks and charities and see all the incredible work they are doing to reduce hunger in our communities. Ask these organizations how the Federal antipoverty programs support their efforts to bring food to those most in need.

I urge all my colleagues to remember this fact:

Today, in the United States of America, the richest country in the history of the world, over 42 million of our fellow citizens are hungry. They are kids, senior citizens, people who can't find work, and many people who are, in fact, working. They defy stereotypes. But all of them are our brothers and sisters, and we should care. We should absolutely do more than we are doing right now to end hunger in America.

The Federal Government, working with charities and local partners, has, within its grasp, the power to end hunger now; what we lack is the political will. Let's at long last create the political will and guarantee that, in our country, no one ever has to struggle with food insecurity or hunger. We can end hunger now.

□ 1015

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN BILL BARRETT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of former Congressman Bill Barrett. He passed away earlier this week in his hometown of Lexington, Nebraska.

Mr. Barrett devoted his life to service. From his speakership in the State legislature to the years he spent in Congress, he was known for being true to his word and bringing people together to get things done. Serving Nebraskans was his top priority, and his dedication to the Third District and our State set a lasting example for me and all who have sought to fill his shoes.

Mr. Barrett was an influential conservative leader and a champion of agriculture. The Third District is now the top-producing agriculture district in the country, and we owe much of that to Mr. Barrett's tireless work.

His former staff have recounted how he would always ask: "Does this help the Third District?"

He was a true statesman who sought to serve others rather than himself. He worked so hard representing the 60-plus counties of the Third District for the 10 years that he served.

I extend my condolences to Mr. Barrett's wife and tremendous teammate, Elsie, and their family.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to request a moment of silence.

CONGRESSIONAL INABILITY TO PASS THE NDAA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, this is a sage-grouse. I found out that the sage-grouse have poor eyesight, so they often collide with barbed wire fences and other obstructions that are difficult to see. And these collisions are often fatal.

But the sage-grouse looks like a keen-eyed hawk compared to Congress. That is because the sage-grouse recently collided with the National Defense Authorization Act, and the near-sighted bird won. Hopefully this time it won't be fatal.

We were supposed to vote to send the NDAA to the President this week, but a disagreement between the House and the Senate Republicans about the sage-grouse got egg all over the deal. That is right, a bill that authorizes over \$600 billion in spending on wartime operations, weapons acquisition, service-member benefits, and many other provisions critical to the defense of our country was taken down by a bird. But unlike the plane that landed in the Hudson River, Congress doesn't seem to have a Captain Sully to rescue it from bird-induced mayhem.

Don't get me wrong. The NDAA has many problems. It redirects billions in critical funding towards a program the Defense Department does not want. It sidesteps the Bipartisan Budget Act compromise by requiring supplemental funding just to keep the Pentagon running. It contains a myriad of poison pill riders, from allowing contractors to engage in discrimination against the LGBTQ employees, to releasing tens of thousands of handguns into our communities with no background checks.

All of these reasons are why I voted against the bill in committee and on the House floor. Nonetheless, the conference report is a compromise between the Senate and the House on complex issues ranging from funding operations against ISIS to military healthcare reform, a compromise on everything but this pesky bird.

House Republicans stubbornly refuse to remove language that would prohibit the sage-grouse from being placed

on the Endangered Species List, despite the fact that no one is trying to list it. Placing an animal on the Endangered Species List is a scientific decision not within the purview of Congress, and the administration has promised not to list the bird anyway, thanks to a compromise conservation plan. So the provision that is holding up the entire bill not only blatantly prioritizes politics over national security policy, it is legally meaningless.

I think Speaker RYAN put it best earlier this month when he said that playing politics over the NDAA is “shameless, and it threatens more than five decades of bipartisan cooperation to enact a national defense bill for our troops. The men and women who defend our country deserve better.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, then your party is chicken for prioritizing talking points over national security.

The sage-grouse is such an important issue to House Republicans that it makes you wonder what they will do next to contain the serious national security threat. Perhaps we will soon hear calls to build a wall on the Canadian border to prevent sage-grouse from sending their chicks across the border, even though some, I assume, are good hatchlings.

We may then hear about a plan to prevent sage-grouse from entering the country altogether until we find out what is going on. Maybe the Republicans will ban sage-grouse mating dances as breeding grounds for—well, if not terrorism, then, at least more sage-grouse.

But, seriously, colleagues, is this really what our constituents are most concerned about?

It is time to focus on passing a bill that provides accountability on defense spending to taxpayers and is in line with the Bipartisan Budget Act. Our inability to overcome this pointless provision is just further evidence that this Congress is for or, in this case, against the birds.

UNHCR'S BASH ISRAEL DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this week, world leaders are gathering in New York for the United Nations General Assembly, and throughout this whole process we are reminded yet again of just how broken the U.N. system really is.

Nowhere is this more evident than at the U.N. Human Rights Council. What a misnomer. This body that is supposed to promote and defend human rights worldwide has become a tool used by human rights abusers. And the office that provides support to the Council, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, OHCHR, is no better, as it is overrun with an anti-Israel bias and an anti-Israel agenda.

We see this play out each time the Council meets for its Bash Israel Day—

yippee—a day dedicated to permanent Agenda Item 7, the only agenda item of the Council devoted to a single country, Israel.

This year marks the 10th anniversary of the Council. In those 10 years, Mr. Speaker, there have been over 70 resolutions condemning Israel and about 65 resolutions for all of the other countries combined. Seventy on Israel, 65 for every other country. Countries like China, Russia, Vietnam, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, and Cuba use the Council as a way to detract attention from their abuses and play upon the natural anti-Israel bias at the Council and the OHCHR.

So tomorrow, when the Council meets to discuss Agenda Item 7, it will be another Bash Israel Day that the administration failed to prevent. It will be another example of how this administration's influence fails to protect our friend and ally, the democratic Jewish State of Israel.

Instead of continuing to legitimize this sham of a body, Congress must withhold all contributions and participation at the Council and to the OHCHR, and call for the dissolution of the Council. The administration must press the High Commissioner to denounce Agenda Item 7 and work against the inherent anti-Israel bias of the Council and the Office of the High Commissioner of Human Rights.

Earlier this year, Canadian Professor Michael Lynk was appointed as the Special Rapporteur for the Palestinian territories, despite his obvious bias and conflicts of interest, which we now know he lied about in his paperwork. This selection was so egregious that Canada's Foreign Minister from Professor Lynk's home country urged the U.N. to reconsider his appointment. The administration should echo those calls, but, instead, it has been silent.

The administration should also lead an opposition to the upcoming reelection next week of Jean Ziegler as an adviser to the Council. Ziegler is a notorious puppet of the Castro regime and an avowed defender of dictators and apologists for Islamic extremist groups and had no business being elected the first time around, let alone being reelected.

The Obama administration had an opportunity to block his candidacy while serving as the coordinator for the Western European and Others Group this year at the Council, but failed to do so; and now it looks as if Ziegler's reelection is a done deal, thanks to the administration's failure to act.

The administration, Mr. Speaker, continues to argue that only by being engaged and only by being full members of the U.N. can it advance our interests and protect Israel. Yet, next month, UNESCO is set to adopt a resolution that seeks to whitewash the Jewish and Christian religious and historical ties to Jerusalem. And while we might not be voting members of the full UNESCO body, this administration is an active member of UNESCO's exec-

utive committee, where this resolution was first approved.

Where was our influence then?

We can't even prevent a resolution that wipes away Jewish and Christian ties to Jerusalem, despite these being historical facts. It is very apparent that either the administration has no influence at the U.N. or the administration has no desire to upset the entrenched and damaged status quo.

That is why it is up to Congress, Mr. Speaker, to force the change at the U.N. I urge all of my colleagues to take a long, hard look at the Human Rights Council as a representation of all that is wrong and bad with the U.N., and to make reforming the U.N. a priority going forward. It will be up to us.

COMMEMORATING THE 1956 HUNGARIAN REVOLUTION AGAINST THE SOVIET UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage in a colloquy with my very able colleague from Florida, Congressman DENNIS ROSS. And perhaps as we begin, we can welcome into our midst the very able Ambassador from Hungary to the United States, Ms. Reka Szemerkenyi.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. ROSS).

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for yielding. And I do wish to say hello to our good friend from Hungary, Ambassador Szemerkenyi.

I am grateful, quite frankly, to have this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, as I rise today to recognize the 60th anniversary of the Hungarian Revolution and Freedom Fight.

Sixty years ago this October, Hungary stood tall in the shadows of communism and said: Enough is enough—eleg volt. Hungarian schoolchildren and college students took up arms against the totalitarian government and its Soviet policies.

On October 23, 1956, approximately 20,000 protesters convened next to the statue of General Jozef Bem, a national hero of Hungary. Despite orders to disband, protestors tore down a 30-foot bronze statue of Stalin near the city's Heroes' Square.

The following morning, power was consolidated and a new multiparty government was formed. The Hungarian Revolution spread like wildfire throughout the countryside.

On November 1, Prime Minister Imre Nagy announced Hungary's withdrawal from the Warsaw Pact and a declaration of neutrality. Embarrassed by the uprising, the USSR sent Soviet tanks and troops across the Hungarian border. Unfortunately, thousands of Hungarian civilians were killed, and the communist-backed government in Budapest was reinstalled.

In the months that followed the Hungarian Revolution, more than 20,000